hester Cooper and Daniel Davidson

Ultra Secret': We Know Too Much, Too Little

The most important—and the most sturbing-secret of World War II has cently been disclosed. In "The Ultra cret", Group Captain F. W. Winter-•tham reveals that the British broke e German secret radio code. Well bere America's entry into the war and -ntinuing until V-E Day, messages beeen the Nazi High Command and erman field generals were deciphered the British within hours, often within inutes of their dispatch.

"Ultra" played a vital role in every ajor Anglo-American military camign against the Germans. Wintertham maintains that without informaon from "Ultra" that the German -my was cracking, British and Amerin forces would have moved eastward uch more cautiously and would have ined the Russians at the Rhine ther than at the Elbe. All of Gerany would have been under Soviet -ntcol, Journalist Alfred Friendly, who as a member of the Ultra group, says atly that Ultra "made victory possible

The tremendous strategic and tacti-I advantages accruing to British and merican forces as a consequence of is historic intelligence breakthrough ises an ugly question: Why did not e Anglo-American Command share is information with the Soviet Union hich, after all, was engaging the bulk the German forces? Conceivably, if e information had been shared, the ar could have been concluded even oner than the spring of 1945, thus zving millions of lives. A school of storians, the "revisionists", has long aimed that the Western Allies purmed a peripheral strategy—North Afea, Sicily, Italy-instead of mounting n early frontal assault on Normandy, part at least, to exhaust the Rusans. They will surely now claim that ilure to share "Ultra" with Moscow oves their point.

But before they seize their pens, ey might do well to ponder a less

the information might be "turned": that the code the antagonist knows you know will be used for false information, while a new and unbroken code will be employed for his true communications.

The extent to which nations will go to conceal their possession of Communications Intelligence is illustrated by reveal, the Johnson administration could have used communications intelligence to prove to a skeptical public that Hanoi had indeed ordered attacks on the American destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf during the summer of 1964. But the information was too precious to be used for such a purpose. And in February 1965, President Johnson, despairing at the unwillingness of an articulate sector of American opinion to recognize Hanoi's deep involvement in the command and support of the Viet Cong in the South, ordered 'the evidence of this involvement to be published. The authors of the resulting white paper could have documented the administration's claim, convincingly - but only by the use of communications intelligence. As a consequence, they produced a thin and unconvincing document that served only to widen the administration's credibility gap.

Ultra was of immeasurably greater value to the British than our communications intelligence was in Vietnam. The issue was not credibility. It was survival. This source had to be preserved for the gravest possible threats -- for example, an attempted invasion of England, itself. Thus, the British knew in advance of Goering's orders to the Luftwaffe when Coventry was targeted, but the population was not given warning to evacuate. When Oxford was on the target list, the Oxonians among the code-breakers made a sentimental pilgrimmage to see the old Colleges, perhaps for the last time, but no special warnings were given to the Air Defense Command. The beloved

sinister, more plausible explanation. Communication Intelligence is the crown jewel in the vaults of every spy establishment skillful enough to acquire it. Many CIA, MI-6 or Deuxieme Bureau officers will grudgingly admit that many of their "secrets" can be divined from a close reading of The Washington Post, the London Times or Le Monde. But when they smugly add "except for the critical five per cent" they are referring to communications intelligence. It is this that makes the difference between "will" and "might" between "probability" and "certainty".

Even now, communications intelligence is held extremely closely, for continuing access to such vital information depends on the discrmination with which it is used. When a potential or actual enemy realizes that you Washington's actions early in the Viet know (not suspect, not guess, but namese war. As the Pentagon Papers know), years of painstaking effort can be lost and a nation's ability to anticipute future grave threats to its national survival could be jeopardized. There is also the awful possibility that

Actor Leslie Howard was sent on a secret mission in an unarmed, uncscorted plane even though the British apparently knew the Germans were going to intercept his aircraft.

The British decision not to share "Ultra" with Moscow may well have rested on a national fear that in some manner-perhaps by moving conspicuously and precipitately to repel "surprise" attacks on major cities Soviet generals might reveal to the Germans that their code had been broken. Moreover, it is important to remember Churchill's persistent suspicion that the Soviet General Staff had been penetrated by the Germans. None of this is to say that the British did not warn Stalin of the impending German invasion of Russia in the spring of 1941. Stalin was indeed told by Churchill that "unimpeachable sources" had revealed that Hitler was planning to move eastward. But Stalin ignored the warning. Before making a final judgment, we must ask how much did Moscow know about German plans and intentions which it did not choose to share with London and Washington?

One can speculate, but having allowed publication of the details of Ultra, the British have opened a Pando-"a's hox. We know both too much and too little. To stop a flood of unhealthy suspicion and a torrent of recrimination, London must now tell us more.

P- WinterbothAm, F.W.